



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,502	09/15/2003	Mu Li	M61.12-0527	9194
27366 7590 02/07/2008 WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319			EXAMINER SERROU, ABDELALI	
			ART UNIT 2626	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/07/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/662,502	LI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Abdelali Serrou	2626	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Abdelali Serrou. (3) Steven Koehler (Reg.No.36,188).  
 (2) Lina Ji (Reg. No. 49,027). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 05 February 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 14, and 25.


Identification of prior art discussed: Chen, Brockett, and Pederson.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney Steve Koehler requested from the examiner not to respond to the amendment filed on 1/14/08, because of the deficiency of the argument corresponding to the 35 USC 101 rejection, and a supplemental amendment will be submitted in a later time. Regarding the obviousness rejection, it was agreed that the prior art reads on the claims language and a further amendment to the claims language may overcome the prior art reference.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
**DAVID HUDSPETH**  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2000



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required